arXiv:0901.2392v1 [math.AC] 16 Jan 2009

ON THE LINEARITY OF ARTIN FUNCTIONS

TRUNG T. DINH

Abstract. It was proved by Elkik that, under some smoothness conditions, the Artin functions of systems of polynomials over a Henselian pair are bounded above by linear functions. This paper gives a stronger form of this result for the class of excellent Henselian local rings. The linearity of Artin functions of systems of polynomials in one variable is also studied. Explicit calculations of Artin functions of monomials and determinantal ideals are also included.

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, all rings are Noetherian commutative with identity. Let R be such a ring and $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_r)$ a system of polynomials in $R[X_1, \dots, X_N]$. For an R-algebra S and an element $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_N) \in S^N$, we use the notation $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a})$ to denote the set $\{f_1(\mathbf{a}), \dots, f_r(\mathbf{a})\}$ of elements in S. By abuse of notation we shall often identify $\mathbf{f}$ with the ideal generated by $f_1, \dots, f_r$, and $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a})$ with the ideal generated by $f_1(\mathbf{a}), \dots, f_r(\mathbf{a})$ when it is clear that there is no room for confusion.

Definition 1.1. (*Artin approximation property*) Let R be a commutative ring, $I \subset R$ an ideal. Let $\widehat{R}$ be the completion of R with respect to the I-adic topology. Let $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_r) \subseteq R[X_1, \dots, X_N]$ be a system of polynomials. We say that the system $\mathbf{f}$ has the Artin approximation property (AP) with respect to (R, I) if for each positive integer c and for each $\widehat{\mathbf{a}} = (\widehat{a}_1, \dots, \widehat{a}_N) \in \widehat{R}^N$ with $\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{a}}) = 0$, there is $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_N) \in R^N$ such that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) = 0$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{a}} \equiv \mathbf{a} \pmod{I^c \widehat{R}^N}$.

If all systems of polynomials over R have AP then we say that (R, I) has AP, or that (R, I) is an approximation ring. When $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a local ring, we will say that R has AP if $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ has.

It is well-known that to show that the ring R has AP it suffices to show that any system of polynomial equations over R is solvable whenever it is solvable over $\widehat{R}$.

Definition 1.2. (*Strong Artin approximation property and Artin functions*) Let $R, I, \widehat{R}$ and $\mathbf{f}$ be as in the above definition. We say that the system $\mathbf{f}$ has the strong Artin approximation property (SAP) with respect to (R, I) if there exists a sequence $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ of positive integers with the following property. For each positive integer n and for each $\mathbf{a} =$

$(a_1, \dots, a_N) \in R^N$ such that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) \subseteq I^{\beta_n}$, there is $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_N) \in R^N$ such that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}) = 0$ and $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b} \pmod{I^n R^N}$.

If all systems of polynomials over R have SAP then we say (R, I) has SAP. When $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a local ring, we will say that R has SAP if $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ has. If for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we choose β_n to be smallest possible then the function $\beta(\mathbf{f})\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}, n \mapsto \beta_n$, is called the Artin function (associated to the system $\mathbf{f}$). This function, if exists, depends only on the ideal generated by $f_1, \dots, f_r$.

It has been proven ([1],[2],[3],[11],[12],[13],[14],[17],[18],[19],[21]) that a Noetherian local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ has AP if and only if it has SAP, and if and only if it is excellent and Henselian.

In [20] Spivakovsky announced a theorem, referred to as the Linear Artin Approximation Theorem, without proof however, asserting that for several classes of local rings (basically these are rings for which the existence of Artin functions is verified), the Artin function associated to any system of polynomial equations is bounded above by a linear function. Since there was no proof provided, the question on the linearity of Artin functions is then of interest. Not much work in this direction however has been published so far.

The first result was perhaps due to Greenberg ([7]) who proved that Henselian discrete valuation rings, under some separability conditions, have the linear approximation property, though by that time this term had not been used. Elkik ([6]) studied this question in a more general set up, namely on Noetherian Henselian pairs. During the course of the proof of the main theorem in [4] (see also [5]), the authors proved the linearity of the Artin function for a certain system of a single polynomial equation. Explicit calculations of linear bounds for the Artin functions of hypersufaces with isolated singularity over a power series ring in one variable appeared in papers by Lejeune-Jalabert ([10]) and Hickel ([8]). However recently Rond, in [15], [16], provided two counterexamples to the above claim of Spivakovsky. Thus the Artin functions in general are not bounded by linear functions.

This paper is concerned with the linearity of Artin functions. The main result of the paper shows the linearity of the Artin functions under some smoothness conditions, which strengthens a result of Elkik for the class of excellent Henselian local rings. Its proof is carried out in Section 2. The third section deals with the Artin functions of systems of polynomials in one variable. Explicit calculations of Artin functions of monomial and determinantal ideals will be studied in the last section.

2. Main Theorem

As mentioned in the introduction, this section is motivated by the work of Elkik in [6]. We need the following definitions in order to state the theorem of Elkik that inspired the main theorem of this section.

Definition 2.1. (Elkik [6]) Let R be a commutative ring, $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_r)$ a system of polynomials in $R[X_1, \dots, X_N]$. Whenever $1 \le i_1 < \dots < i_p \le r$ denote by $\Delta(i_1, \dots, i_p)$ the ideal generated by the p-minors of the Jacobian matrix $\big(\frac{\partial f_{i_j}}{\partial X_k}\big)_{j=1,\dots,p}^{k=1,\dots,N}$. Then we define

$$H_{\mathbf{f}/R} = \sum_{1 \le i_1 < \dots < i_p \le r} \Delta(i_1, \dots, i_p)\big((f_{i_1}, \dots, f_{i_p}) :_R (f_1, \dots, f_r)\big).$$

It is well-known ([6]) that $H_{\mathbf{f}/R}$ is the smooth locus of the quotient ring $R[X_1, \dots, X_N]/(\mathbf{f})$ over R.

Recall that a pair (R, I) with $I \subseteq \mathrm{rad}(R)$ is called a Henselian pair if it satisfies the Hensel's Lemma. There are many other equivalent definitions of Henselian pairs, and the one that is most useful in the studies of Artin approximation is the following.

Definition 2.2. A pair (R, I) with $I \subseteq \mathrm{rad}(R)$ is called a Henselian pair if it satisfies the following property: for each system of polynomials $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_r) \subseteq R[X_1, \dots, X_r]$, and for each $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_r) \in R^r$ such that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) \subseteq I$ and the determinant of the Jacobian matrix $\big(\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial X_j}(\mathbf{a})\big)_{i,j=1,\dots,r}$ is a unit, then there is $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_r) \in R^r$ such that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}) = 0$ and $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b}$ mod IR^r.

Now we can state the following theorem of Elkik.

Theorem 2.3. [6, Theorem 2, Section II] *Let (R, I) be a Henselian pair. Then for each integer h there is a pair (n_0, r) with the following property. For each system of polynomials $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_r) \subset R[X_1, \dots, X_N]$, for each $n > n_0$ and each $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_N) \in R^N$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) &\subseteq I^n \\ H_{\mathbf{f}/R}(\mathbf{a}) &\supseteq I^h, \end{aligned}$$

there is $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_N) \in R^N$ satisfying $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}) = 0$ and $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b}$ mod $I^{n-r}R^N$.

Roughly speaking, this theorem assures the linearity of the Artin functions whenever the smooth locus of the quotient ring $R[X_1, ..., X_N]/(\mathbf{f})$ is "big". By restricting ourselves to the class of excellent Henselian local rings we obtain a stronger result, which is the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be an excellent Henselian local ring of dimension d containing a field. Let $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_r)$ be a system of polynomials in $R[X_1, \dots, X_N]$. Let $t_1, \dots, t_{d-1}$ be elements in R such that t_i is not in any minimal prime of $(t_1, \dots, t_{i-1})$ for all $i \ge 1$. Then there is a linear function $\beta : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with the following property: for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_N) \in R^N$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) &\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{\beta(n)} \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) + H_{\mathbf{f}/R}(\mathbf{a}) &\supseteq (t_1, \dots, t_{d-1}), \end{aligned}$$

there is $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_N) \in R^N$ such that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}) = 0$ and $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b}$ (mod $\mathfrak{m}^n R^N$).

For the proof of this theorem we need some auxiliary lemmas. The first lemma is concerned with the behavior of the Artin functions under module-finite extensions. It is well-known that the approximation property is preserved under module-finite extensions. The proof for this fact can be easily adjusted to show that the same conclusion holds for the strong approximation property. In what follows the Linear Approximation property is abbreviated as LAP.

Lemma 2.5. *Let S be a module-finite R-algebra, $I \subset R$ an ideal. Suppose (R, I) has SAP. Then (S, IS) also has SAP. Furthermore, if (R, I) has LAP then so does (S, IS).*

Proof. We can write $S = Rs_1 + \cdots + Rs_p$. Let ϕ be the R-linear map $R^p \longrightarrow S$ defined by $\phi(e_i) = s_i$ for all i, where the e_i form the standard basis for R^p. Suppose $\ker \phi \subseteq R^p$ is generated by $z_1 = \begin{pmatrix} z_{11} \\ \vdots \\ z_{1p} \end{pmatrix}, \ldots, z_l = \begin{pmatrix} z_{l1} \\ \vdots \\ z_{lp} \end{pmatrix}, z_{ij} \in R$.

Let $F_1, \ldots, F_r$ be a system of polynomials in $S[X_1, \ldots, X_N]$. For each $i = 1, \ldots, N$ we introduce new variables $X_{i1}, \ldots, X_{ip}$ and write

$$F_i(\sum_{j=1}^{p} X_{1j}s_j, \ldots, \sum_{j=1}^{p} X_{Nj}s_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} F_{ij}(X_{11}, \ldots, X_{Np})s_j,$$

where the F_{ij} are polynomials with coefficients in R. Define new variables $T_{ij}, i = 1, \ldots, r, j = 1, \ldots, l$. Let β be a linear bound for the Artin function of the system $\{G_{ik} = F_{ik}(X_{11}, \ldots, X_{Np}) - \sum_{j=1}^{p} T_{ij}z_{jk} | \quad i = 1, \ldots, r; k = 1, \ldots, N\}$ of polynomials in $R[\{X_{ij}\}, \{T_{ij}\}]$. We claim that this function is also a bound for the Artin function of the system $\{F_i\}$ in $S[X_1, \ldots, X_N]$.

Suppose for some $\{a_i\} \subset S$ we have $F_i(a_1, \ldots, a_N) \in I^{\beta(n)}S$ for all i. We can write $a_i = \sum_{j=1}^{p} a_{ij}s_j$ with $a_{ij} \in R$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{p} F_{ij}(a_{11}, \ldots, a_{Np})s_j &\in I^{\beta(n)}S \\ \Longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} F_{i1}(a_{11}, \ldots, a_{Np}) \\ \vdots \\ F_{ip}(a_{11}, \ldots, a_{Np}) \end{pmatrix} &\in I^{\beta(n)}R^p + \ker \phi \\ \Longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} F_{i1}(a_{11}, \ldots, a_{Np}) \\ \vdots \\ F_{ip}(a_{11}, \ldots, a_{Np}) \end{pmatrix} - \sum_{j=1}^{l} u_{ij} \begin{pmatrix} z_{j1} \\ \vdots \\ z_{jp} \end{pmatrix} &\in I^{\beta(n)}R^p \end{aligned}$$

for some $u_{ij} \in R$.

This implies that $\{a_{ij}\}, \{u_{ij}\}$ is an approximate solution of order $\beta(n)$ of the system $\{G_{ik}\}$. Then there are$\{b_{ij}\}, \{v_{ij}\}$ consisting of elements of R such that $a_{ij} \equiv b_{ij}, u_{ij} \equiv v_{ij} \mod I^n$

and $F_{ik}(\{b_{ij}\}) = \sum_{j=1}^{l} v_{ij} z_{jk}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, r; k = 1, \ldots, p$. Define $b_i = \sum_{j=1}^{p} b_{ij} s_j$. Clearly we have $a_i \equiv b_i \mod I^n S$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} F_{i1}(b_{11}, \ldots, b_{Np}) \\ \vdots \\ F_{ip}(b_{11}, \ldots, b_{Np}) \end{pmatrix} &= \sum_{j=1}^{l} v_{ij} \begin{pmatrix} z_{j1} \\ \vdots \\ z_{jp} \end{pmatrix} \in \ker \phi \\ \Longrightarrow F_i(b_1, \ldots, b_N) &= \sum_{j=1}^{p} F_{ij}(b_{11}, \ldots, b_{Np}) s_j = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

The next easy lemma often helps us to reduce the problems to the complete case.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local ring, $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \ldots, f_r)$ a system of polynomials in $R[X_1, \ldots, X_N]$. Suppose this system has AP. If this system, viewed as polynomials over $\widehat{R}$, has SAP then it has SAP as polynomials over R. The conclusion also holds if we replace SAP by LAP.*

Proof. View $(f_1, \ldots, f_r)$ as polynomials in $\widehat{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_N]$. Let β be a bound for the Artin function of this system with respect to $(\widehat{R}, \widehat{\mathfrak{m}})$. We claim that this function also works for the system viewed as polynomials in $R[X_1, \ldots, X_N]$. Indeed, suppose there is $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_N) \in R^N$ such that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{\beta(n)} \subseteq \widehat{\mathfrak{m}}^{\beta(n)}$. Then there is $\widehat{\mathbf{a}} = (\widehat{a}_1, \ldots, \widehat{a}_N) \in \widehat{R}^N$ such that $\mathbf{a} \equiv \widehat{\mathbf{a}} \pmod{\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}^n}$ and $\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{a}}) = 0$. Since $\mathbf{f}$ has AP over R by the hypothesis, we can find $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_N) \in R^N$ such that $\mathbf{b} \equiv \widehat{\mathbf{a}} \pmod{\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}^n}$ and $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}) = 0$. □

The proof of the main theorem uses induction on the dimension of the ring, for which we will need the following result on the rings of dimension one.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be an excellent Henselian local ring of dimension 1 which is assumed to be an integral domain in the mixed characteristic case. Then R has LAP.*

Proof. We know that with the given hypothesis R has AP. By Lemma 2.6 it suffices to assume that R is complete. Using the Cohen structure theorem there is a coefficient ring of R over which R is a finite module. Since R has dimension 1, this coefficient ring must be a complete DVR, denoted by (V, p). By a theorem of Greenberg ([7]), (V, p) has LAP. Thus (R, pR) has LAP by Lemma 2.5. But the ideal pR is $\mathfrak{m}$-primary, so $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ also has LAP. □

The following lemma tells us the behavior of the smooth locus after adjoining a certain equation to the system.

Lemma 2.8. *Let* $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ *and* $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_r) \subseteq R[\mathbf{X}]$. *Suppose* $H_{\mathbf{f}/R}$ *is generated by* $g_1, \dots, g_M$ *in* $R[\mathbf{X}]$. *Let* $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_M), \mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_T)$ *be new variables and* $h \in R[\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}]$. *Define* $G = h + Y_1 g_1 + \dots + Y_M g_M \in R[\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}]$. *Then*

$$H_{\mathbf{f},G/R} \supseteq \big(H_{\mathbf{f}/R}\big)^2 R[\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}].$$

Proof. Whenever $1 \le i_1 < \dots < i_p \le r$ denote by $\Delta^G_{i_1,\dots,i_p}$ the ideal generated by the $(p+1)$-minors of the Jacobian matrix of the system $f_{i_1}, \dots, f_{i_p}, G$. This matrix can be explicitly calculated as

$$\begin{pmatrix}
\frac{\partial f_{i_1}}{\partial X_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial f_{i_p}}{\partial X_1} & \frac{\partial G}{\partial X_1} \\
. & \dots & . & \dots \\
\frac{\partial f_{i_1}}{\partial X_N} & \dots & \frac{\partial f_{i_p}}{\partial X_N} & \frac{\partial G}{\partial X_N} \\
0 & \dots & 0 & g_1 \\
. & \dots & . & . \\
0 & \dots & 0 & g_M \\
0 & \dots & 0 & \frac{\partial G}{\partial Z_1} \\
. & \dots & . & . \\
0 & \dots & 0 & \frac{\partial G}{\partial Z_r}
\end{pmatrix}$$

Consider the $(p+1)$-minor of this matrix formed by the rows corresponding to $X_{j_1}, \dots, X_{j_p}$ and g_k for some $1 \le j_1 < \dots < j_p \le N, 1 \le k \le M$. This minor is clearly equal to the product of g_k and the p-minor of the Jacobian matrix (in $R[\mathbf{X}]$) of $f_{i_1}, \dots, f_{i_p}$ formed by the rows corresponding to $X_{j_1}, \dots, X_{j_p}$. We can deduce from this fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta^G_{i_1,\dots,i_p} &\supseteq \Delta_{i_1,\dots,i_p}(g_1, \dots, g_M) R[\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}] \\
&= \Delta_{i_1,\dots,i_p} H_{\mathbf{f}/R} R[\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}].
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\mathbf{f},G/R} &\supseteq \sum_{1 \le i_1 < \dots < i_p \le r} \Delta^G_{i_1,\dots,i_p}\big((f_{i_1}, \dots, f_{i_p}, G) :_R (f_1, \dots, f_r, G)\big) \\
&\supseteq \sum_{1 \le i_1 < \dots < i_p \le r} \Delta^G_{i_1,\dots,i_p}\big((f_{i_1}, \dots, f_{i_p}) :_R (f_1, \dots, f_r)\big) \\
&\supseteq \sum_{1 \le i_1 < \dots < i_p \le r} \Delta_{i_1,\dots,i_p}\big((f_{i_1}, \dots, f_{i_p}) :_R (f_1, \dots, f_r)\big) H_{\mathbf{f}/R} R[\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}] \\
&= \big(H_{\mathbf{f}/R}\big)^2 R[\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}].
\end{aligned}$$

□

We will also need the following lemma of Elkik.

Lemma 2.9. [6, Lemma 1, Section I] *Let* R *be a complete ring with respect to the* (t)*-adic topology for some* $t \in R$. *Then for each integer* h *there is an integer* n_0 *with the following* *property. For any ideal* I *of* R, $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \ldots, f_r) \subset R[X_1, \ldots, X_N]$, *for all* $n > n_0$ *and for all* $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_N) \in R^N$ *with*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) &\subseteq t^n I \\ H_{\mathbf{f}/R}(\mathbf{a}) &\supseteq (t^h), \end{aligned}$$

there is $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_N) \in R^N$ *satisfying* $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}) = 0$ *and* $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b}$ *mod* $t^{n-h} I R^N$.

We are now able to prove the main theorem.

Proof. (of Theorem 2.4) We may assume that R is complete. Indeed, suppose the theorem is proven for the complete local ring $(\widehat{R}, \mathfrak{m}\widehat{R})$. Then, in particular, there is a function $\beta : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ satisfying: for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, each $\mathbf{a} \in R^N$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) &\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{\beta(n)} \widehat{R} \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) + H_{\mathbf{f}/\widehat{R}}(\mathbf{a}) &\supseteq (t_1, \ldots, t_{d-1})\widehat{R}, \end{aligned}$$

there is $\widehat{\mathbf{b}} \in \widehat{R}^N$ with $\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{b}}) = 0$ and $\mathbf{a} \equiv \widehat{\mathbf{b}}$ (mod $\mathfrak{m}^n \widehat{R}^N$). We claim that the same function β satisfies the conclusion of the theorem. Let $\mathbf{a} \in R^N$ be such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) &\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{\beta(n)} R \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) + H_{\mathbf{f}/R}(\mathbf{a}) &\supseteq (t_1, \ldots, t_{d-1})R. \end{aligned}$$

Since $H_{\mathbf{f}/\widehat{R}} \supseteq H_{\mathbf{f}/R}\widehat{R}$, the above relations remain true if we replace R with $\widehat{R}$. By the choice of β there is $\widehat{\mathbf{b}} \in \widehat{R}^N$ with $\mathbf{f}(\widehat{\mathbf{b}}) = 0$ and $\mathbf{a} \equiv \widehat{\mathbf{b}}$ (mod $\mathfrak{m}^n \widehat{R}^N$). Because R is excellent and Henselian, hence has AP, we can find $\mathbf{b} \in R^N$ with $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}) = 0$ and $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b}$ (mod $\mathfrak{m}^n \widehat{R}^N$), hence $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b}$ (mod $\mathfrak{m}^n R^N$).

We prove the theorem by induction on the dimension of R. The case $\dim R = 0$ is trivial. For the case $\dim R = 1$ the result is clear due to Theorem 2.7. Suppose $\dim R > 1$. We may assume that $t_1 \in \mathfrak{m}$, otherwise the ideal $(t_1, \ldots, t_{d-1})$ will be the whole ring R and then the theorem will follow from Theorem 2.3.

Apply Lemma 2.9 with $t = t_1, h = 1$. Let n_0 be as in the statement of that lemma and choose $s \geq n_0 + 2$. By the Artin-Rees Lemma there is k such that $(t_1)^s \cap \mathfrak{m}^{n+k} \subseteq (t_1)^s \mathfrak{m}^n$ for all $n > 0$.

Let $\overline{(-)}$ denote passing modulo $(t_1)^s$. Suppose $H_{\mathbf{f}/R} = (g_1, \ldots, g_M), g_i \in R[\mathbf{X}]$. Introduce new variables $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_M), \mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_r)$ and let

$$G(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) = Z_1 f_1 + \cdots + Z_r f_r + Y_1 g_1 + \ldots + Y_M g_M - t_1 \in R[\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}].$$

Since $\dim \bar{R} < \dim R$, by the induction hypothesis there is a linear function $\beta : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ satisfying the following condition: for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbf{a} \in R^N, \mathbf{y} \in R^M, \mathbf{z} \in R^r$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \big(\bar{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}), \bar{G}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})\big) &\subseteq \overline{\mathfrak{m}}^{\beta(n)} \\ \big(\bar{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}), \bar{G}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})\big) + H_{\bar{\mathbf{f}},\bar{G}/\bar{R}}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}) &\supseteq (\bar{t}_2 \ldots, \bar{t}_{d-1})^2, \end{aligned}$$

there is $\mathbf{b} \in R^N, \mathbf{u} \in R^M, \mathbf{v} \in R^r$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{b}}) &= \bar{G}(\bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar{\mathbf{v}}) = 0 \\ \bar{\mathbf{a}} &\equiv \bar{\mathbf{b}} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^n \bar{R}^N}. \end{aligned}$$

We may assume that $\beta(n) > n$. Then we claim that the function $\beta_k : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}, \beta_k(n) = \beta(n+k)$ will satisfy the conclusion of the theorem. Indeed, suppose for some $\mathbf{a} \in R^N$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) &\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{\beta(n+k)} \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) + H_{\mathbf{f}/R}(\mathbf{a}) &\supseteq (t_1, \ldots, t_{d-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The second inclusion implies that there is $\mathbf{y} \in R^M, \mathbf{z} \in R^r$ such that $G(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = 0$. (Here we need $d > 1$ which explains why we can't start the induction process from the dimension 0.) Thus by Lemma 2.8 we have relations

$$\begin{aligned} \big(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}), G(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\big) &\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{\beta(n+k)} \\ \big(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}), G(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\big) + H_{\mathbf{f},G/R}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) &\supseteq (t_1, \ldots, t_{d-1})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $H_{\bar{\mathbf{f}},\bar{g}/\bar{R}} \supseteq \overline{H}_{\mathbf{f},g/R}$, all the relations here remain true after replacing everything with its quotient modulo $(t_1)^s$. Thus by the definition of β there is $\mathbf{b}' \in R^N, \mathbf{u} \in R^M, \mathbf{v} \in R^r$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{a}} &\equiv \bar{\mathbf{b}}' \bmod \mathfrak{m}^{n+k} \bar{R}^N \\ f(\bar{\mathbf{b}}') &= G(\bar{\mathbf{b}}', \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar{\mathbf{v}}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We may assume $\mathbf{b}' \equiv \mathbf{a} \bmod \mathfrak{m}^{n+k} R^N$. The second relation of the above implies

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}') \subseteq (t_1)^s,$$

and

$$v_1 f_1(\mathbf{b}') + \cdots + v_r f_r(\mathbf{b}') + u_1 g_1(\mathbf{b}') + \cdots + u_M g_M(\mathbf{b}') - t_1 \in (t_1)^s.$$

It follows that

$$(t_1) \subseteq H_{\mathbf{f}/R}(\mathbf{b}') + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}') + (t_1)^s \subseteq H_{\mathbf{f}/R}(\mathbf{b}') + (t_1)^s,$$

which implies $H_{\mathbf{f}/R}(\mathbf{b}') \supseteq (t_1)$ using Nakayama's lemma (note that $s \geq 2$). Since $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b}'$ (mod $\mathfrak{m}^{n+k} R^N$) we have

$$f_i(\mathbf{b}') \equiv f_i(\mathbf{a}) \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^{n+k}} \in \mathfrak{m}^{\beta(n+k)} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{n+k}$$

for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Thus

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}') \subseteq (t_1)^s \cap \mathfrak{m}^{n+k} \subseteq (t_1)^s \mathfrak{m}^n,$$

by the choice of k. From Lemma 2.9 it follows that there is $\mathbf{b} \in R^N$ such that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}) = 0$ and $\mathbf{b}' \equiv \mathbf{b} \bmod (t_1)^{s-1} \mathfrak{m}^n R^N \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^n R^N$. Clearly $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{a}$ (mod $\mathfrak{m}^n R^N$). $\square$

Example. Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be an excellent Henselian local domain of dimension 2 containing a field (e.g $R = k[[T_1, T_2]]$). Then the LAP holds for any single equation $f = g(\mathbf{X}) + tY$, where $t \in R, t \neq 0, g \in R[\mathbf{X}]$, since $H_{(f)/R} \supset (t)$. Note that such a general statement can not be true if we replace Y by Y^2, due to a counterexample of G. Rond in [15].

3. Polynomials In One Variable

In this section we study the linearity of the Artin functions of systems of polynomial equations in only one variable over a reduced approximation ring. We would like to recall a well-known property of approximation rings that if an approximation (local) ring is reduced then its completion is also reduced.

We need some lemmas for the proof of the main result of this section.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be an analytically irreducible local domain and let $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \ldots, f_r) \subseteq R[X_1, \ldots, X_N]$. Suppose for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ the polynomial f_i has a decomposition $f_i = f_{i1} \cdots f_{ik_i}$ as a product of polynomials such that LAP holds for every system of polynomials $(f_{1j_1}, \ldots, f_{rj_r})$, $1 \leq j_1 \leq k_1, \ldots, 1 \leq j_r \leq k_r$. Then the LAP holds for the system $\mathbf{f}$.*

Proof. Let $\beta_{j_1 \ldots j_r}$ be a linear bound for the Artin function of the system $f_{1j_1}, \ldots, f_{rj_r}$ for each $1 \leq j_1 \leq k_1, \ldots, 1 \leq j_r \leq k_r$. Let $k = \max_{i=1\ldots r}\{k_i\}$. By [22, Theorem 4.3], there is a constant c such that for every n, whenever $z_1 z_2 \cdots z_k \in \mathfrak{m}^{cn}$ with $z_i \in R, i = 1, \ldots, k$, we can find i such that $z_i \in \mathfrak{m}^n$. We claim that the function $\beta = c(\max\{\beta_{j_1 \ldots j_r}\})$ is a linear bound for the Artin function of the system $\mathbf{f}$. Indeed, suppose for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $\mathbf{a} \in R^N$ we have $f_i(\mathbf{a}) \in \mathfrak{m}^{c(\max\{\beta_{j_1 \ldots j_r}\})(n)}$ for all i. Since $f_i = f_{i1} \cdots f_{ik_i}$ and by the choice of c, for each i there is $j_i \in \{1, \ldots, k_i\}$ such that $f_{ij_i}(\mathbf{a}) \in \mathfrak{m}^{\max\{\beta_{j_1 \ldots j_r}\}(n)}$. Hence the collection $\{j_1, \ldots, j_r\}$ has the property that $f_{ij_i}(\mathbf{a}) \in \mathfrak{m}^{\beta_{j_1 \ldots j_r}(n)}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$. By the definition of β we can find $\mathbf{b} \in R^N$ such that $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b} \mod \mathfrak{m}^n R^N$, and $f_{ij_i}(\mathbf{b}) = 0, i = 1, \ldots, r$, which also satisfies $f_i(\mathbf{a}) = 0$ for all i. □

It was proved in [16, Theorem 3.1] that every system of homogeneous linear equations over a Noetherian local ring has LAP. The same is true for any system of linear equations.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local ring. Then every system of linear equations over R has LAP.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{f} = (f_i = c_{i1}X_1 + \cdots + c_{iN}X_N + d_i \mid \quad i = 1, \ldots, r)$ be a system of linear equations over R. Let Y be a new variable and define $g_i = c_{i1}X_1 + \cdots + c_{iN}X_N + d_iY, i = 1, \ldots, r$. Then $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \ldots, g_r)$ is a system of homogeneous equations over R in $N + 1$ variables $X_1, \ldots, X_N, Y$. By Theorem 3.1 in [16], there is a linear bound β for the Artin function of this system. Then this is also a bound for the Artin function of $\mathbf{f}$. Indeed, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_N) \in R^N$ be such that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{\beta(n)}$. Hence $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{a}, 1) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{\beta(n)}$. Then there is $(b_1,\dots,b_N,u)\in R^{N+1}$ such that $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{b},u)=0$ and $(\mathbf{a},1)\equiv(\mathbf{b},u) \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^nR^{N+1}}$. That implies that u is a unit in R. This finishes the proof of the lemma since $\mathbf{f}(u^{-1}\mathbf{b})=0$ and $\mathbf{a}\equiv u^{-1}\mathbf{b} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^nR^N}$. □

The main result of this section is the following theorem whose proof is inspired by the work of Rond in [16].

Theorem 3.3. *Let $(R,\mathfrak{m})$ be an excellent Henselian reduced local ring. Then the Artin functions associated to systems of polynomials in one variable are bounded by linear functions.*

Proof. By the remark at the beginning of this section, we may assume that $(R,\mathfrak{m})$ is complete. We first prove the theorem for the case R is a domain, hence it is analytically irreducible. Let $(f_1,\dots,f_r)\subseteq R[X]$ be a system of polynomials in one variable X. View them as polynomials over the quotient field $Q(R)$ of R. Then for each i the polynomial f_i has a decomposition $f_i=f_{i1}\cdots f_{ik_i}$ in to irreducible polynomials over $Q(R)$. Since we have only a finite number of polynomials, there is $E\in R, E\neq 0$ such that $Ef_{ij}\in R[X]$ for all i,j. Suppose we can prove that each system $(Ef_{1j_1},\dots,Ef_{rj_r})$, $1\le j_1\le k_1,\dots,1\le j_r\le k_r$ has LAP then by the lemma, the system $E^{k_1}f_1,\dots,E^{k_r}f_r$ has LAP, which clearly implies that the system $(f_1,\dots,f_r)$ has LAP. Therefore, we may assume that each f_i is irreducible in $Q(R)[X]$. It follows that for each i, either f_i is linear, or f_i has no solution in the quotient ring of R, in particular in R. If for each $i=1,\dots,r$ the polynomial f_i is linear then the Artin function of the system $\mathbf{f}$ is bounded by a linear function by Lemma 3.2. If there is some i such that f_i has no solution in R, then there is a positive integer c such that for all $a\in R$ we have $f_i(a)\notin\mathfrak{m}^c$. Indeed, if that number c does not exist, then since R has the strong approximation property, there would be a solution in R for f_i which is a contradiction. Now it is clear that the constant function $\beta(n)=c$ is a bound for the Artin function of the system $\mathbf{f}$.

Let us consider a complete reduced local ring $(R,\mathfrak{m})$. Let $P_1,\dots,P_k$ be all minimal primes in R. Let $\mathbf{f}=(f_1,\dots,f_r)\subseteq R[X]$. In R/P_i the system $\mathbf{f}$ has either only finite number of roots or is identically equal to 0. For each i for which the system $\mathbf{f}$ is not identically equal to 0 in R/P_i we consider a set of some elements in R whose images in R/P_i form a complete set of all roots of $\mathbf{f}$. Let S be the union of all such sets. Then S is finite. For each i let $P_i=(p_{i1},\dots,p_{it})$.

By the previous part, there is a constant $c\in\mathbb{N}$ such that the linear function $n\mapsto cn, n\in\mathbb{N}$, is a common linear bound for Artin functions of $\mathbf{f}$ in R/P_i for every i. Let $Y_{ij}, i=1,\dots,k, j=1,\dots,t$ be new variables and consider all possible systems of linear equations over R, each equation is of the form $\{u_i+\sum_j p_{ij}Y_{ij}-u_l-\sum_j p_{lj}Y_{lj}, u_i,u_l\in S \mid \quad j=1,\dots,t\}$. The above lemma assures that for each such system there exists a linear bound for its Artin function. There are only finitely many such systems. Hence we can find $d\in\mathbb{N}$ such that the function $n\mapsto dn, n\in\mathbb{N}$, is a bound for the Artin function of every system of this kind. We claim that the function $\beta\colon n\mapsto cdn, n\in\mathbb{N}$, is a bound for the Artin function of the system $\mathbf{f}$ in R.

Let $a \in R$ be such that $\mathbf{f}(a) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{cdn}$. Passing modulo P_i we get that, by the definition of c, for each i there is $a_i \in S$ such that $\mathbf{f}(a_i) \subseteq P_i$ and $a \equiv a_i \pmod{P_i + \mathfrak{m}^{dn}}$. Then there is $\mathbf{u} = (u_{ij}) \in R^{kt}$ such that

$$a \equiv a_i + \sum_{j=1}^{t} p_{ij} u_{ij} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^{dn}}.$$

Define

$$L_{il}(\mathbf{Y}) = a_i + \sum_j p_{ij} Y_{ij} - a_l - \sum_j p_{lj} Y_{lj}$$

for all $i = 1, \ldots, k, l = 1, \ldots, t$. Then $L_{il}(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathfrak{m}^{dn}$ for all i, l. By the choice of d, there is $\mathbf{b}' = (b'_{ij}) \in R^{kt}$ such that $L_{il}(\mathbf{b}') = 0$ and $\mathbf{u} \equiv \mathbf{b}' \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^n R^{kt}}$. Define

$$b = a_i + \sum_j p_{ij} b'_{ij}, \text{ for some } i.$$

This definition does not depend on i. Clearly $b \equiv a \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^n}$. We need to show that $\mathbf{f}(b) = 0$. This is true, since $\mathbf{f}(b) \equiv \mathbf{f}(a_i) \equiv 0 \pmod{P_i}$ for all i, and $\cap_i P_i = 0$. ☐

4. Explicit Calculations Of Artin Functions

4.1. Monomial ideals.

We shall show that over a regular local ring the Artin functions associated to systems of monomial ideals are actually linear.

Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local domain and $\mathbf{X} = X_1, \ldots, X_N$ be indeterminates over R. For each $\alpha = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_N) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^N$ define $|\alpha| = i_1 + \cdots + i_N$, $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha) = \{j : i_j > 0\}$ and $\mathbf{X}^\alpha = X_1^{i_1} \cdots X_r^{i_N}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local ring and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ vectors in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^N$. With the notation as above we have*

$$\beta_n(\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{X}^{\alpha_k}) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \beta_n(\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_i}),$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_N) \in R^N$ be such that

$$(\mathbf{a}^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}^{\alpha_k}) \in \mathfrak{m}^{\max \beta_n(\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_i})}.$$

From $\mathbf{a}^{\alpha_1} \in \mathfrak{m}^{\max \beta_n(\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_i})} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{\beta_n(\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_1})}$, there is $j_1 \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha_1)$ such that $a_{j_1} \in \mathfrak{m}^n$. Consider the set of all α_i whose supports do not contain j_1 and without loss of generality we may assume that α_2 is one of them. Again there is $j_2 \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha_2)$ such that $a_{j_2} \in \mathfrak{m}^n$. Consider the set of all α_i whose supports do not contain j_1 or j_2, and so on. Iterating the process we can find a collection of indices $\{j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_s\}$ for which every α_i has its support containing one of these indices. Now we define

$$b_j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j \in \{j_1, \ldots, j_s\} \\ a_j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_N) \in R^N$ is a solution of the system $\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{X}^{\alpha_k}$ and $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^n}$. ☐

Lemma 4.2. *(i) Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be an analytically irreducible local domain. Then for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^N_{\geq 0}$ there is $c \in \mathbb{N}$ not depending on n such that $\beta_n(\mathbf{X}^\alpha) \leq cn$ for all n.*

(ii) If $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a regular local ring then $\beta_n(\mathbf{X}^\alpha) = |\alpha|n - |\alpha| + 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. (i) Since $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is an analytically irreducible domain, by [22, Theorem 4.3] there is an integer $c' > 0$ such that for every n if $uv \in \mathfrak{m}^{c'n}$ then either u or v belongs to $\mathfrak{m}^n$. We claim that $c = (c')^{N+|\alpha|}$ will satisfy the conclusion of (i). Indeed, let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_N) \in R^N$ be such that $\mathbf{a}^\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}^{cn}$. Then by the property of c', there is $j \in \mathrm{supp}(\alpha)$ with $a_j \in \mathfrak{m}^n$. Define $\mathbf{b} = (a_1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, a_N)$, where 0 is at the j^{th}-place, which satisfies $\mathbf{b}^\alpha = 0$ and $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^n}$.

(ii) Let $\mathbf{a} \in R^N$ be such that $\mathbf{a}^\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}^{|\alpha|n-|\alpha|+1}$. Since R is regular, there is $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\alpha)$ such that $a_i \in \mathfrak{m}^n$. Then define $\mathbf{b} = (a_1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, a_N)$ where 0 is at the i^{th}-place. Clearly $\mathbf{b}$ satisfies $\mathbf{b}^\alpha = 0$ and $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^n}$. Thus we have the inequality $\beta_n(\mathbf{X}^\alpha) \leq |\alpha|n - |\alpha| + 1$.

Conversely, consider a vector $\mathbf{a} \in R^N$ with $a_i \in \mathfrak{m}^{n-1} - \mathfrak{m}^n$ for all i. We have $\mathbf{a}^\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}^{|\alpha|n-|\alpha|}$ but there is no solution $\mathbf{b}$ such that $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^n}$. Hence $\beta_n(\mathbf{X}^\alpha) > |\alpha|n - |\alpha|$ and therefore we have the above equality. ☐

Theorem 4.3. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local domain. Let $I = (\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{X}^{\alpha_k}) \subset R[X_1, \ldots, X_N]$ be a monomial ideal with $|\alpha_1| \geq |\alpha_2| \geq \ldots \geq |\alpha_k|$.*

(i) If $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is not analytically irreducible then the Artin function of the polynomial X_1X_2 does not exist.

(ii) If $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is an analytically irreducible domain then there is c such that $\beta_n(I) \leq cn$ for all $n \in N$.

(iii) If $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a regular local ring then $\beta_n(I) = |\alpha_s|n - |\alpha_s| + 1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $s = \min\{i | supp(\alpha_i) \not\supseteq supp(\alpha_j) \text{ for every } j > i\}$.

Proof. (i) (cf [9, Proposition 3.4]) Since $\widehat{R}$ is not a domain, there are $\hat{u}, \hat{v} \in \widehat{R}$ nonzero and $\hat{u}\hat{v} = 0$. By Krull's intersection theorem, there is n such that $\hat{u}, \hat{v} \notin \hat{\mathfrak{m}}^n$. Let $\{u_k\}, \{v_k\}$ be two sequences in R that converge to $\hat{u}, \hat{v}$. Then there is l such that $u_k, v_k \notin \mathfrak{m}^n$ for all $k > l$. But u_kv_k converges to $uv = 0$, so for each m there is $k_m > l$ such that $u_{k_m}, v_{k_m} \in \mathfrak{m}^m$ but none of u_{k_m}, v_{k_m} belongs to $\mathfrak{m}^n$. Therefore the Artin function of X_1X_2 does not exist.

(ii) Using Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 we have $\beta_n(I) \leq c^{N+\max_{1\leq i\leq k}|\alpha_i|}n$ for all n.

(iii) We will first show that $\beta_n(\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}^{\alpha_k}) \leq |\alpha_s|n - |\alpha_s| + 1$. To prove this let $\mathbf{a} \in R^N$ be such that

$$(\mathbf{a}^{\alpha_1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{\alpha_k}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{|\alpha_s|n - |\alpha_s|+1}.$$

Since $|\alpha_s|n - |\alpha_s| + 1 \geq \beta_n(\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_i})$ for all $i \geq s$, we can find $\mathbf{b} \in R^N$ such that $\mathbf{b}^{\alpha_i} = 0$ for all $i \geq s$ and $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b} \bmod \mathfrak{m}^n$. For $i < s$ we have $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha_i) \supseteq \operatorname{supp}(\alpha_s)$. Thus $\mathbf{b}$ is also a solution for the whole system $\{\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_i}, i = 1 \dots, k\}$.

It remains to show that $\beta_n(\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}^{\alpha_k}) > |\alpha_s|n - |\alpha_s|$. For each $j \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha_s)$ choose $a_j \in \mathfrak{m}^{n-1} - \mathfrak{m}^n$. Since $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha_t) \not\subseteq \operatorname{supp}(\alpha_s)$ for every $t > s$, there is $j_t \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha_t) - \operatorname{supp}(\alpha_s)$. Choose $a_{j_{s+1}} = \ldots = a_{j_k} \in \mathfrak{m}^{|\alpha_s|(n-1)}$ arbitrarily. For $i \notin \{\operatorname{supp}(\alpha_s)\} \cup \{j_{s+1}, \dots, j_k\}$ let a_i be arbitrary. Then it is clearly that $(\mathbf{a}^{\alpha_s}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{\alpha_k}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{|\alpha_s|(n-1)}$. By the definition of s, for each $i < s$ there is $t \geq s$ such that $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha_i) \supseteq \operatorname{supp}(\alpha_t)$. If $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha_i) \supseteq \operatorname{supp}(\alpha_s)$ then $\mathbf{a}^{\alpha_i} \in \mathfrak{m}^{|\alpha_s|(n-1)}$ because $|\alpha_i| \geq |\alpha_s|$. If $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha_i) \supseteq \operatorname{supp}(\alpha_t)$ with $t \geq s+1$ then we still have $\mathbf{a}^{\alpha_i} \in \mathfrak{m}^{|\alpha_s|(n-1)}$ since $j_t \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha_t)$ and $a_{j_t} \in \mathfrak{m}^{|\alpha_s|(n-1)}$. This says that $(\mathbf{a}^{\alpha_1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{\alpha_k}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{|\alpha_s|(n-1)}$. Then in this case for every true solution $\mathbf{b}$ of the system $\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}^{\alpha_k}$ we have $\mathbf{a} \not\equiv \mathbf{b} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^n}$. Therefore we have proved the converse inequality and then $\beta_n(\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}^{\alpha_k}) = \beta_n(\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_2}, \dots, \mathbf{X}^{\alpha_k}) = |\alpha_s|n - |\alpha_s| + 1$. □

4.2. **Determinantal ideals.** We shall compute the Artin functions associated to any determinantal ideal over a DVR and show that it is actually a linear function.

Theorem 4.4. *Let (R, t) be a discrete valuation ring. Let $\mathbf{X} = \{X_{ij} | i = 1 \dots k, j = 1 \dots l\}$ be a set of variables over R with $k \leq l$. Given $1 \leq r \leq k$, denote by I_r the ideal of $R[\mathbf{X}]$ generated by all r-minors of the matrix $(X_{ij})_{i,j}$. Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\beta_n(I_r) = rn - r + 1.$$

Proof. We prove this theorem by induction on r. The case $r = 1$ is trivially true. Suppose we have proved for ideals generated by $(r-1)$-minors of all matrices (X_{ij}) of any size. We shall first prove that $\beta_n(I_r) \leq rn - r + 1$. Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_{ij}) \in R^{kl}$ be an approximate solution of order $rn - r + 1$ of the defining equations of I_r. That means

$$I_r \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1l} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2l} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{k1} & a_{k2} & \dots & a_{kl} \end{pmatrix} \subset (t)^{rn-r+1}.$$

Let v be the (discrete) valuation associated to (R, t) and suppose $v(a_{11}) = \min_{i,j}\{v(a_{ij}), a_{ij} \neq 0\}$. We wish to find a solution $\mathbf{b} = (b_{ij}) \in R^{kl}$ such that $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b} \pmod{(t)^n R^{kl}}$. If $v(a_{11}) \geq n$ then clearly we can take $\mathbf{b} = 0$. Suppose $v(a_{11}) \leq n - 1$. Note that we have $a_{ij}a_{11}^{-1} \in R$ for all i, j. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & I_r \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_{12}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & a_{1l}a_{11}^{-1} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2l} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{k1} & a_{k2} & \dots & a_{kl} \end{pmatrix} \subset (t)^{rn-r+1-v(a_{11})} \subseteq (t)^{(r-1)n-(r-1)+1} \\ \implies & I_r \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_{12}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & a_{1l}a_{11}^{-1} \\ 0 & a_{22}-a_{12}a_{21}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & a_{2l}-a_{1l}a_{21}a_{11}^{-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & a_{k2}-a_{12}a_{k1}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & a_{kl}-a_{1l}a_{k1}a_{11}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \subset (t)^{(r-1)n-(r-1)+1} \\ \implies & I_{r-1} \begin{pmatrix} a_{22}-a_{12}a_{21}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & a_{2l}-a_{1l}a_{21}a_{11}^{-1} \\ a_{32}-a_{12}a_{31}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & a_{3l}-a_{1l}a_{31}a_{11}^{-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{k2}-a_{12}a_{k1}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & a_{kl}-a_{1l}a_{k1}a_{11}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \subset (t)^{(r-1)n-(r-1)+1}. \end{aligned}$$

By induction there is $\mathbf{b}' = (b'_{ij})_{i,j\geq 2} \in R^{(k-1)(l-1)}$ such that

$$I_{r-1} \begin{pmatrix} b'_{22} & b'_{23} & \dots & b'_{2l} \\ b'_{32} & b'_{33} & \dots & b'_{3l} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ b'_{k2} & b'_{k3} & \dots & b'_{kl} \end{pmatrix} = 0,$$

and $a_{ij} - a_{1j}a_{i1}a_{11}^{-1} \equiv b'_{ij} \pmod{(t)^n}$ for all $i, j \geq 2$. Define

$$b_{ij} = \begin{cases} a_{ij} \text{ if } i = 1 \text{ or } j = 1 \\ b'_{ij} + a_{1j}a_{i1}a_{11}^{-1} \text{ if } i, j > 1. \end{cases}$$

It is clearly that $a_{ij} \equiv b_{ij} \pmod{(t)^n}$ for all i, j. We claim that $\mathbf{b} = (b_{ij})_{i,j}$ is a solution of I_r. Indeed,

$$\mathbf{b} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1l} \\ a_{21} & b'_{22}+a_{12}a_{21}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & b'_{2l}+a_{1l}a_{21}a_{11}^{-1} \\ a_{31} & b'_{32}+a_{12}a_{31}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & b'_{3l}+a_{1l}a_{31}a_{11}^{-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{k1} & b'_{k2}+a_{12}a_{k1}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & b'_{kl}+a_{1l}a_{k1}a_{11}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

is the sum of two matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & b'_{22} & b'_{23} & \dots & b'_{2l} \\ 0 & b'_{32} & b'_{33} & \dots & b'_{3l} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ 0 & b'_{k2} & b'_{k3} & \dots & b'_{kl} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1l} \\ a_{21} & a_{12}a_{21}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & a_{1l}a_{21}a_{11}^{-1} \\ a_{31} & a_{12}a_{31}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & a_{1l}a_{31}a_{11}^{-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{k1} & a_{12}a_{k1}a_{11}^{-1} & \dots & a_{1l}a_{k1}a_{11}^{-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

which are of rank at most $r-2$ and 1 (resp). Thus rank($\mathbf{b}$) is at most $r-1$, which means all of its r-minors are 0, as desired.

Now we shall show that $\beta_n(I_r) > rn - r$. Consider the following matrix

$$\mathbf{a} = (a_{ij})_{i,j} = \begin{pmatrix} t^{n-1} & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & t^{n-1} & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & t^{n-1} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & . & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in R^{kl},$$

where $a_{ii} = t^{n-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. It is an approximate solution of order $(t)^{rn-r}$. Let $\mathbf{b} = (b_{ij})_{i,j}$ be any solution of I_r. If $\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{b} \pmod{(t)^n}$ then $v(b_{ij}) \geq n$ for all $i \neq j$, and $v(b_{ii}) = n - 1$. Consider the submatrix $(b_{ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq r}$. It has the determinant

$$\det(b_{ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq r} = b_{11} \dots b_{rr} + \sum_{\delta \in S_r, \delta \neq id} (-1)^{sgn(\delta)} b_{1\delta(1)} \dots b_{r\delta(r)},$$

which is not equal to 0 since $v(b_{11} \dots b_{rr}) = n(r-1)$ and $v(b_{1\delta(1)} \dots b_{r\delta(r)}) > n(r-1)$ for all $\delta \neq \mathrm{id}$, a contradiction. Thus $\beta_n(I_r) > rn - r$. Hence the equality $\beta_n(I_r) = rn - n + 1$ follows. ☐

Remark 4.5. There is no hope to have the linearity of the Artin functions of determinantal ideals over rings of dimension at least 3, due to a counterexample by Rond in [16]. However the question on the linearity of the Artin function of the polynomial $XY - ZW$ over the power series ring in 2 variables $k[T_1, T_2]$ is still unknown.

Acknowledgment. This project was started and most of it was carried out when I was working under the direction of Irena Swanson at New Mexico State University. I would like to thank her for introducing me to the theory of Artin approximation and for many helpful conversations and for her ceaseless encouragement. I would also like to thank Paul C. Roberts and the referee for many suggestions to improve the presentation of this paper.

References

[1] M. Artin, *Algebraic approximation of structures over complete local rings*, Publ. Math. IHES **36**, 1969, 23–58.

[2] M. Artin, *Algebraic structure of power series rings*, Con. Math. **13**, 1982, 223–227.

[3] M. Artin, *On the solutions of analytic equations*, Invent. Math. **5**, 1968, 277-291.

[4] D. Delfino, I. Swanson, *Integral closure of ideals in excellent local rings*, J. Algebra **187** (1997), no. 2, 422–445.

[5] D. Delfino, I. Swanson, Erratum to "*Integral closure of ideals in excellent local rings*", J. Algebra **274** (2004), 422–428.

[6] P. Elkik, *Solutions d'équations a coefficients dans un anneau hensélien,* Ann. Scient. Éc. Norm. Sup. 4^e série, t.6, (1973), 553–604.

[7] M. Greenberg, *Rational points in henselian discrete valuation rings,* Publ. Math. IHES **23**, (1964), 563–568.

[8] M. Hickel, *Fontion de Artin et germes de courbes tracées sur un germe d'espace analytique*, Amer. J. Math. **115** (1993), 1299–1334.

[9] R. Hubl, I. Swanson, *Discrete valuations centered on a local domains,* J. Pure. Appl. Algebra **161** (2001) 145–166.

[10] M. Lejeune-Jalabert, *Courbes tracées sur un germe d'hypersurface*, Amer. J. Math. **112** (1990), 525–568.

[11] T. Ogoma, *General Néron desingularization base on the idea of Popescu*, J. Algebra **167**, 1984, 57–84.

[12] G. Pfister, D. Popescu, *Die strenge Approximationseigenschaft lokaler Ringe.* Invent. Math. **30** (1975), No. 2, 145–174.

[13] D. Popescu, *General Néron desingularization.* Nagoya Math. J. **100** (1985), 97–126.

[14] D. Popescu, *General Néron desingularization and approximation.* Nagoya Math. J. **104** (1986), 85–115.

[15] G. Rond, *Sur la linéarité de la fonction de Artin*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) 38 (2005), no. 6, 979–988.

[16] G. Rond, *Lemme d'Artin-Rees, théorème d'Izumi et fonction de Artin*, J. Algebra 299 (2006), no. 1, 245–275.

[17] C. Rotthaus, *Rings with approximation property*, Math. Ann **287**, (1990) 455–466.

[18] C. Rotthaus, *On the approximation property of excellent rings,* Invent. Math **88**, (1987) 39–63.

[19] M. Spivakovsky, *A new proof of D. Popescu's theorem on smoothing of ring homomorphisms.* J. Amer. Math. Soc. **12** (1999), No. 2, 381–444.

[20] M. Spivakovsky, *Valuations, the linear Artin approximation theorem and convergence of formal functions.* Algebra and geometry (Santiago de Compostela, 1989), Álxebra **54**, Univ. Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, 1990, 237–254.

[21] R. Swan, *Néron-Popescu desingularization.* Algebra and geometry (Taipei, 1995), Lect. Algebra Geom. **2**, Internat. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1998, 135–192.

[22] I. Swanson, *Linear equivalence of ideal topologies.* Math. Z **234** (2000) 755–775.

Department of Mathematics, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Email address: `dinh@math.utah.edu`.